Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 9 1966
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the Supreme Court
OF THE
United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1965

No. ~~1292~~ 721

The PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

MARY MORAN PAJALICH,
Chief Counsel for the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
5072 State Building,
San Francisco, California 94102,
Attorney for Petitioner.

PERNAU-WALSH PRINTING CO., SAN FRANCISCO

Subject Index

	Page
Opinions, Orders and Notices Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented	2
Statutes Involved	5
Statement of the Case	6
A. The parties and the nature of their interests	6
B. The proceeding before the Commission	7
C. The proceedings in the court below	12
Reasons for Granting the Writ	13
A. The decision of the court below and the public notice and memorandum opinion and order of the FCC are contrary to the intent and purpose of the Federal Communications Act	16
1. The policy underlying the Act has been contradicted	16
2. The Act calls for a standard of just and reasonable rates	17
3. FCC abused its discretion when it acted from an uninformed position	18
B. The decision of the court below and the public notice and memorandum opinion and order of FCC fail to give effect to the relationship between AT&T and affiliate Western Electric Company	19
1. FCC did not consider reasonableness of prices paid by AT&T Bell System to Western Electric Company	19
2. FCC has been given the duty of regulating Western Electric manufacturing, supply and construction activities in lieu of its divestiture from Bell System, and has failed to discharge its duty	21
C. FCC's privately negotiated interstate telephone rate reductions accomplished without any opportunity to be heard afforded to those affected thereby and without essential findings may result in rate reductions being enjoyed by classes of customers not properly entitled thereto	23

Page

D. Privately conducted ratemaking proceedings are contrary to the law of due process and sound public policy 26

E. FCC's public notice was in reality a binding agency action approving and prescribing rates for the future 27

Conclusion 31

Appendix A 1

Appendix B 13

Appendix C 15

Table of Authorities Cited

Cases

Pages

Ohio Bell Tel. Co. v. Comm'n. (1937) 301 U.S. 292..... 26

Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co. v. P.U.C., 62 Cal.2d 671..... 20

Pub. Utils. Com. of the State of Calif. v. U.S.A., F.C.C., 356 F.2d 236 (CA 9 1966), (Appendix A) 2

Smith v. Illinois Bell Telephone Co., 282 U.S. 133, 148, 75 L.Ed. 255 (1930) 23

Statutes

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 United States Code:

Section 1001(C) 5, 11, 26, 28

Section 1001(G) 5, 11, 26, 28

Section 1003 ..... 3, 5

Section 1004 5

Section 1006 .....3, 5, 26

Section 1007 .....3, 5, 26

California Public Utilities Code, Section 307 6

California Constitution, Article XII, Sections 22-23 6

Constitution of the United States, Fifth Amendment 3

Pages

Federal Communications Act, 47 United States Code:
Section 151 ..... 3, 5, 16
Section 152 5
Section 154(J) 3, 4, 5, 26
Section 201 ..... 5, 17
Section 202 5
Section 203 5
Section 204 ..... 3, 5, 26
Section 205 ..... 3, 5, 26
Section 206 5
Section 207 5
Section 208 5
Section 211 5
Section 212 5
Section 213 5
Section 214 5
Section 215 ..... 5, 20
Section 216 5
Section 217 5
Section 218 5
Section 219 5
Section 220 5
Section 221 5
Section 402 ..... 2, 3, 5, 12
Section 403 ..... 3, 5
Section 405 5

Judicial Review Act, 5 United States Code, Chapter 19A:
Section 1031 ..... 5, 12
Section 1032 ..... 5, 12
Section 1033 ..... 5, 12
Section 1034 ..... 5, 12
Section 1037(b) 5
Section 1040 2

28 United States Code, Section 1254(1) 2

Opinions of State Regulatory Agencies

Inv. of The Pacific Tel. and Tel. Co., 62 Cal.P.U.C. 775 (1964) 20

Miscellaneous

	Pages
Business Week, Jan. 9, 1965	10
Cong. Record, 78 p. 8824	20
FCC Public Notice No. 82425-C, April 7, 1966	13
FCC Public Notice, September 30, 1953	15
Preliminary Report on Communication Cos. H.R. 2223, 73d Cong., 2nd Sess. (1934), April 18, 1934 pursuant to H.R. Res. 30, 72d Cong., 1st Sess. (1932), H.R. Res. 572, 72d Cong., 2d Sess. (1933)	14
Report of Antitrust Subcommittee (No. 5), Judiciary Committee H.R., 86th Cong., 1st Sess., H.R. Res. 27	21
Rules U. S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, Rule 23	2
Separations Manual N.A.R.U.C.	24
Senate Report 752, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 31	15, 27
Subcommittee Committee On Appropriations, U.S. Senate, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., H.R. 7997, May 18, 1965, p. 449	7, 19, 27, 29
Telecommunications Reports, Nov. 30, 1964	10
Wall Street Journal, Nov. 27, 1964	10

In the Supreme Court
OF THE
United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1965

No.

The PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit

The Petitioner, Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (California), respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the decision and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit made and entered in the above-entitled case on February 9, 1966.